



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,834	04/13/2006	Franz Amtmann	AT03 0057 US1	5660

65913 7590 04/28/2009
NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER

RUSHING, MARK S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/28/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/575,834	Applicant(s) AMTMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark Rushing	Art Unit 2612	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Scott Pojunas (Reg. No. 62,590). (3) Mark Rushing.

(2) Sean Whaley. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 4/22/09.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-8 and 14-17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Doany (US 6,377,203).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives discussed the proposed amendment and explained the limitation of how a collision is handled by the communication device (what a first replacement unit is and how it is generated). Examiner agreed on stated differences between claims and prior art, then discussed changes to the Specification and to Claims 5-8 and 14-17, and reminded the representatives to avoid new matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Daniel Wu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612
--	---